



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,189	07/11/2001	Chunming Niu	100647-9210	9352

31013 7590 06/04/2003

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
919 THIRD AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10022

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KOPEC, MARK T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1751	9

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application N .</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/903,189	NIU ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Mark Kopec	1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-52,54 and 55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-44 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 7/11/01 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1751

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-44 and 53) in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that all claims are directed to the same subject matter and the searches for the groups are the same. This is not found persuasive because, as stated in Paper #5, the elected product claims may be made by a materially different process. The examiner respectfully maintains that the searches required for the two distinct groups are not coextensive.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 1751

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for

Art Unit: 1751

establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-44 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jadamus et al (6,090,459).

Jadamus discloses multilayer plastic compositions having electrically conductive inner layer. The inner layer comprises thermoplastic molding composition containing graphite fibrils

Art Unit: 1751

(Abstract). The reference specifically describes PVDF polymers/copolymers and the instantly claimed carbon nanotubes (Col 4, lines 43-64; Col 6, lines 25-31). The graphite fibrils are present from 1 to 30 wt% (Col 4, lines 65-68; examples). The reference either specifically or inherently anticipates the above listed instant claims.

In the event that any minor modifications are necessary to meet the claimed limitations, such as variation in resistivity or fiber loading, such modifications are well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Claims 1-44 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahass et al (5,651,922).

Nahass discloses high strength conductive polymers. The polymer compositions comprise the instantly claimed conductive carbon nanotubes (1-60 wt%) dispersed in a polymeric matrix material (Abstract; Col 3, lines 24-31; Col 7, lines 25-35). The reference specifically teaches PVDF polymers/copolymers as suitable matrix materials (Col 6, lines 5-10).

Although Nahass et al generally teaches the inclusion of carbon fibrils to the claimed PVDF polymers, the reference does not require these components with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Art Unit: 1751

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formulated a composition, as taught by Nahass et al, which contained carbon fibrils and PVDF in the claimed amounts disclosed and taught by Nahass et al. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success, because such a conductive, high-strength composition containing the claimed components is expressly suggested by the Nahass et al disclosure and therefore is an obvious formulation.

In view of the foregoing, the above claims have failed to patentably distinguish over the applied art.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

The remaining references listed on forms 892 and 1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Kopec whose telephone number is 703 308-1088. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta can be reached on 703 308-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9310 for regular communications and 703 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0661.

*MK*  
Mark Kopec  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

MK  
June 2, 2003